



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,056	09/25/2003	Daniel Alan Brokenshire	AUS920030701US1	5833
40412 7590 07/12/2007 IBM CORPORATION- AUSTIN (JVL) C/O VAN LEEUWEN & VAN LEEUWEN PO BOX 90609 AUSTIN, TX 78709-0609			EXAMINER WEI, ZHENG	
			ART UNIT 2192	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/12/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/671,056

Applicant(s)

BROKENSHIRE ET AL.

Examiner

Zheng Wei

Art Unit

2192

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-14 and 16-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,10-14 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 September 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 03/30/2007, 05/20/2007.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 04/27/2007.
2. Claims 2, 9 and 15 have been canceled.
3. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-8, 10-11, 13-14 and 16-20 have been amended.
4. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-14, and 16-20 remain pending and have been examined.

Information Disclosure Statement

5. The information disclosure statements filed on 03/30/2007 and 05/20/2007 have been placed in the application file, which the information referred to therein has already been considered.

Response to Amendment & Arguments

6. Applicant's amendment filed on 04/27/2007 changes the scope of claims 1, 3-8, 10-14 and 16-20. Therefore a new ground of rejection is applied.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oram (Oram et al., Managing Projects with make) in view of Stallman (Richard M. Stallman, Using the GNU Compiler Collection for GCC3.1)

Claim 1:

Oram discloses a method for compiling source code, said method comprising:

- receiving source code that includes a plurality of source code subtasks (see for example, p.79, example make file receives source code subtasks trac.c and main.c)
- independently selecting compile option (see for example, p.79, lines 9-11, define the proper compile option symbols in CFLAGS for each source file; also see example make file and related text)

But does not explicitly disclose independently selecting a processor type from the plurality of heterogeneous processor types for each of the plurality of source code subtasks. However, Stallman in the same analogous art of source code compilation discloses compilation option of plurality of heterogeneous processors type (see for example, p.10-16, a list of machine dependent options for different

processor types, e.g., p.12 lines 43-46, a set of option can be selected for MIPS processor). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to select different option according to different target process type. One would have been motivated to do so to select the proper symbols in CFLAGS to generate correct type executable code that can be run at different processes as suggested by Oram.

Oram further discloses

- selecting a first processor type from the plurality of heterogeneous processor types for a first source code subtask included in the source code (see for example, p.79, example code "make trac.o 'CFLAGS = -DSTATS -DBSD'; cc -DSTATS -DBSD -c trac.c". The CFLAGS option can also include -m option as Stallman disclosed above for process type); and
- selecting a second processor type from the plurality of heterogeneous processor types for a second source code subtask included in the source code, wherein the second processor type is different than the first processor type(see for example, p.79, example code "make main.o 'CFLAGS = -DBSD'; 'cc -DBSD -c main.c'". The CFLAGS option can also include -m option as Stallman disclosed above for process type); and

creating an object file that includes a first object code corresponding to the first source code subtask and second object code corresponding to the second source code subtask, wherein the first object code is adapted to be processed by the first processor type and the second object code is adapted to be processed

by the first processor type and the second object code is adapted to be processed by the second processor type. (see for example, p.79, example code, "cc -o full_test trac.o main.o". Two object files trac.o and main.o can be generated one object file name "full_test").

Claim 3:

Oram and Stallman discloses the method as described in claim 1 above, Oram also discloses wherein the selection of the first processor type is performed during compilation, the method further comprising:

- retrieving the first source code subtask from the plurality of source code subtasks (see for example, p.79, example make file receives source code subtasks trac.c and main.c);
- determining whether the first source code subtask includes a program directive (see for example, p.78, Conditional compilation, through preprocessor directives like #ifdef and #ifndef); and
- performing the selection of the first processor type in response to the determination (see for example, p.79, example code "S make full_test").

But does not explicitly disclose determining whether the first source code subtask includes a program directive corresponding to one of the plurality of processors. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use #ifdef and #ifndef directives to define process type option for each source code subtask. One would have been

motivated to do so to run on different hardware or operating system as suggested by Oram (see for example, p.78, section "Compiler Option and #ifdef directives", first paragraph, "some of the alternatives reflect the need to compile and run on different hardware or operating systems")

Claim 4:

Oram and Stallman disclose the method as described in claim 1 above, Oram further discloses the method as described in claim 1 further comprising:

- retrieving the first source code subtask from the plurality of source code subtasks (see for example, p.79, example make file receives source code subtasks trac.c and main.c); and
- compiling the first source code subtask, the compiling resulting in byte code (see for example, p.79 example code "make trace.o 'CFLAGS - -DSTATS - DBSD'").

Claim 5:

Oram and Stallman disclose the method as described in claim 4, but does not disclose said method further comprising: sending the byte code to a client over a computer network, wherein the byte code is adapted to be translated into client-specific object code by the client whereby the client-specific object code is formatted based upon a processor type that is located at the client. However, it is

well known in the computer art at the time the invention was made that said byte code, as a type of computer program code can be sent and/or retrieved over computer network using any transmission protocols, e.g., TCP/IP. It is also well known in the computer art that byte code can be interpreted and executed at client machine by using client's Just-In-Time compiler to translated into client specific object code. Therefore, claim 5 is unpatentable over Oram and Stallman and well-known feature discussed above.

Claim 6:

Oram and Stallman disclose the method as described in claim 1 above, Oram further discloses the method comprising:

- retrieving the first source code subtask from the plurality of source code subtasks (see for example, p.79, example make file receives source code subtasks trac.c and main.c);
- identifying one or more operations included in the first source code subtask (see for example, p.79, example code about "make", after running "\$make full_test");)
- matching one or more of the operations with one of the processor types from the plurality of heterogeneous processor types (see for example, p.79, example code for compiling trac.c and main.c file using different option); and

Art Unit: 2192

- performing the selection of the first processor type in response to the matching ((see for example, p.79, example code for compiling trac.c and main.c file using different option and generating different trac.o and main.o files).

Claim 7:

Oram and Stallman disclose the method as described in claim 1 above, Stallman also discloses the method as described in claim 1 further comprising:

- receiving a processor-specific command, the processor specific command (see for example, p.75, section 3.17 Hardware Models and Configurations, lines 11-14, "In addition, each of these target machine types can have its own special options, starting with '-m' to choose among various hardware models or configurations – for example, 68010 vs 68020...")

Oram and Stallman further disclose following

- identifying a processor type from the plurality of heterogeneous processor types (see for example, p.79, example code make use the process type option which is defined in CFLAS as addressed above); and
- performing the selection of the first processor type based upon the processor-specific command (see for example, p.79, "\$make full_test" and related text; also see p.79, "make passes the right -D option to each command" and related text)

Claims 8 and 10-13:

Claims 8, 10-13 are system version for performing the claimed method as in claims 1, 3-6 addressed above, wherein all claimed limitation functions have been addressed and/or set forth above and certainly a computer system would need to run and/or practice such function steps disclosed by Stallman and Oram. Thus, they also would have been obvious.

Claims 14 and 16-20:

Claims 14 and 16-20 are computer program products version of the claimed method, wherein all claimed limitation functions have been addressed in claims 1, 3-7 above respectively. It is well known in the computer art that such method steps can be implemented as computer program and can be practiced and /or stored on a computer operable media. Thus, they also would have been obvious in view of Stallman and Oram's teachings.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
10. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims rejection have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zheng Wei whose telephone number is (571) 270-1059 and Fax number is (571) 270-02059. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:00-15:00.


Art Unit: 2192

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist whose telephone number is 571- 272-1000.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ZW



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER